REMARKS

Overview of the Office Action

Claims 6-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated over U.S. Patent No. 6,968,459 ("Morgan").

Status of the claims

Claims 6 and 8-11 have been amended.

Claims 7, 12, and 13 have been canceled.

Claims 6, 8-11 remain pending.

Rejection of claims 6-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Office Action states that Morgan teaches all of Applicant's recited elements.

Independent claim 6 has been amended to recite a method for providing access to at least one application of a computer by an access protection system. The method includes "connecting to a Universal Serial Bus interface on the computer a transportable storage medium which electronically stores an individual identifier" and "enabling access to the at least one application only if the computer recognizes said individual identifier", "wherein the transportable storage medium is one of a flash memory or another non-volatile storage medium addressed using electrical contacts, and the Universal Serial Bus interface connects the transportable storage medium to one of a CPU, a monitor, a keyboard, and at least one peripheral device of the computer". Support for the claim amendment can be found, at least, in previous claim 7, page 2, lines 21-35; and page 3, lines 24 and 25 of Applicant's originally filed specification.

4

Morgan fails to disclose, teach or suggest the above limitations because the storage device disclosed by Morgan is not "one of a flash memory or another non-volatile storage medium addressed using electrical contacts" and is not connected to a computer using "a Universal Serial Bus interface", as recited in Applicant's claim 6. Furthermore, Morgan fails to disclose "enabling access to the at least one application only if the computer recognizes said individual identifier", because Morgan allows restricted access if the identifier is not recognized.

Morgan discloses a secure computing environment in which a computer automatically operates in a full access data storage mode when it detects the presence of a secure removable storage device. In full access mode, all data of Morgan that is written to the removable storage device is encrypted with a cryptographic key and the user is given access to sensitive data if authorized. Otherwise, the computer operates in a restricted access mode in which the user is unable to write to the removable storage device and is unable to access sensitive data (see abstract).

According to Morgan, when operating the computer in full access mode, three features are enabled for improving data security. First, both read and write to a storage device (151) of Morgan is permitted. Second, all data read from, and written to, the storage device (151) of Morgan is decrypted. Third, the computer (100) of Morgan allows the user to access a local area network (51) and a remote computer (49) (see col. 6, lines 40-48 of Morgan). However, Morgan fails to teach or suggest "enabling access to the at least one application only if the computer recognizes said individual identifier", as recited in independent claim 6. Rather, Morgan is concerned with access to data.

Morgan discloses a plurality of different storage devices and storage media used in the secure computing environment (see col. 3, lines 8-17 of Morgan). However, all of the different

storage devices disclosed by Morgan use magnetic or magneto-optical storage media (e.g. floppy disks, CD-ROMs, tape cartridges, or similar media) which are mechanically addressed. Morgan, however, fails to teach or suggest the use of a flash memory or another non-volatile storage medium that is addressed using electrical contacts, as recited in Applicant's claim 6. Moreover, all of the storage devices (151) disclosed by Morgan need to be placed in a removable media drive (121) for detection (see col. 3, lines 5-8). Thus, Morgan fails to teach or suggest "connecting to a Universal Serial Bus interface on the computer a transportable storage medium which electronically stores an individual identifier", as recited in Applicant's claim 6.

The method for providing access to at least one application of a computer by an access protection system recited in Applicant's claim 6 is more flexible with respect to the computing environment having a secure storage device as disclosed by Morgan. In particular, no additional removable media drive (121) is required in Applicant's recited invention. Using a storage medium connected to a USB interface alleviates the need for mounting a removable media drive into the computer system for implementing the inventive method for providing access. Additionally, flash memories tend to be much smaller, more robust, and, consequently, more portable compared with magnetic or magneto-optical storage media such as floppy diskettes or CD-ROMs. Finally, the method for providing access according to the invention has a different purpose than the computing environment disclosed by Morgan. Morgan is concerned with preventing an authorized user from accessing sensitive data in an unauthorized manner (see col. 1, lines 21-23 of Morgan). In contrast to Morgan, the purpose of the method according to Applicant's recited invention is to provide a simple access protection system for computers that avoids the input of a password (e.g. to grant access to applications to authorized users) (see page 2, lines 10-12 of Applicant's originally filed specification).

Therefore, Morgan fails to teach or suggest a method for providing access to <u>at least one</u> <u>application of</u> a computer by an access protection system that includes, "connecting to a Universal Serial Bus interface on the computer a transportable storage medium which electronically stores an individual identifier" and "enabling access to the at least one application only if the computer recognizes said individual identifier", "wherein the transportable storage medium is one of a flash memory or another non-volatile storage medium addressed using electrical contacts; and the Universal Serial Bus interface connects the transportable storage medium to one of a CPU, a monitor, a keyboard, and at least one peripheral device of the computer", as recited in independent claim 6.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that Morgan to teach or suggest the subject matter recited in Applicant's independent claim 6. Accordingly, claim 6 is not anticipated by Morgan under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

<u>Dependent claims</u>

Claims 7, 12, and 13 have been canceled. Claims 8-11 which depend from independent claim 6, incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 6 and are, therefore, deemed to be patentably distinct over Morgan for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 6, as well as for the additional recitations contained therein.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections, and allowance of all pending claims, are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions, suggestions, or objections, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By _____
Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: December 27, 2007